ORIGINAL

KRASKIN, LESSE & COSSON, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW

TELECOMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS

2120 L Street, N.W., Suite 520 Washington, D.C. 20037

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Telephone (202) 296-8890 Telecopier (202) 296-8893

ORIGINALDecember 6, 2002

RECEIVED

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554 DEC - 6 2002

PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: CC Docket No. 01-92

Ex Parte Letter

Dear Ms. Dortch,

Our firm has been I lested by our colleague Comingde Lee & Gooch to transmit for filing with the Commis in the attached exparte letter on behal 'Oklahoma Western Telephone Company. The letter addresses matters pertaining to the Commission's unified intercarrier compensation proceeding in CC Docket No. 01-92.

Please contact the undersigned if there are any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely

//John Kuykendall

cc: Chairman Michael Powell Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Commissioner Kevin Martin

Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Attachment

No. of Copies rec'd 0 +>
List ABCDE

ORIGINAL

Oklahoma Western Telephone Company

P *O* BOX 399 CLAYTON OK 74536 (918) 569-4111

November 18.2002

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

DEC - 6 2002

FCC Chairman Michael Powell 445 12th Street SW Washington, D.C. 20554

COLFAL COMMERCIATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Dear Mr. Powell:

We operate a small rural telephone company in Oklahoma. Our state operating revenues consists of access charges billed to interexchange carriers, local service revenues billed to our end users, and state and federal funds necessary to help maintain reasonable rates to end users and to help meet the company's revenue requirements. In accordance with orders issued by the Oklahoma Corporations Commission, the small rural telephone companies in Oklahoma are access providers; therefore, they do not provide any retail toll services to end users located within our state certificated boundaries. Wireless carriers have made the choice to not directly connect to our network but rather connect to the RBOC LATA tandem and have contracted with and pay the RBOC to route mobile to land traffic to our networks. When one of our customers makes a land to mobile call, because we are an access provider and have implemented the mandated equal access requirement, that call is handled by the customer's interexchange camer. All toll calls including intraMTA wireless calls are handled by the customer's interexchange camer of choice. My company bills the interexchange camer access in accordance with our interstate and intrastate tariffs as appropriate, the toll provider bills the retail revenues to their customer. It is our opinion that the toll provider should be responsible for any termination charges and or transport charges associated with their traffic. In this case the toll provider is the originating carrier and is responsible for payment of all transport and termination charges to other LEC's and to wireless providers on whose network the call terminates.

We believe our interpretation is consistent with the law the FCC's rules and orders that the access regime principles and the reciprocal compensation principles of Section 251 (b)(5) do not apply to the same traffic. Since the interexchange land to mobile traffic is handled in accordance with the access regime that traffic would not fall within the reciprocal compensation regime, as such then the wireless carrier terminating the interexchange traffic should look to the interexchange carrier for any compensation and not the LEC.





Please confirm to us that our interpretation and application of the access regime and reciprocal compensation principles to traffic as described above is consistent with FCC rules, orders and the law.

I look forward to your prompt response, thank you.

Sincerely;

Michael Van Horn

President

Cc: Commissioner Kathlean Abemathy

Commissioner Michael Copps Commissioner Kevin Martin